



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,938	07/06/2006	Simon Ekstrom	CU-4652 BWH	5173
26530	7590	05/12/2009	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY LLP 224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60604			SISSON, BRADLEY L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/564,938	<b>Applicant(s)</b> EKSTROM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Bradley L. Sisson	<b>Art Unit</b> 1634	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** 071

 (1) Bradley L. Sisson.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Zareefa B. Fleener, Reg. No. 52,896.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 8 May 2009
**Time:** 3:00 PM
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Potential rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph; potential objections to drawings*

Claims discussed:

33

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Bradley L. Sisson/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Mr. Sisson indicated that the amendments to claim 33 would potentially raise an issue under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, noting in particular the use of the phrase "such as" and the adjective "small." Mr. Sisson encouraged applicant to consider filing a supplemental response addressing these issues.

The aspect of amending the claims so to focus on the method and not the limitations of a device was discussed.

Mr. Sisson noted that the replacement figures are not properly labeled, directing attention to 37 CFR 1.84(u)(1).

Ms. Flener indicated that she will contact applicant and discuss the aspect of submitting a supplemental response by May 19th. .